



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/422,804	10/22/1999	EDWIN SOUTHERN	00263/PP/IR	6012	
OIP	7.	590 02/10/2006		EXAM	INER	
•	Wenderoth, L 2033 K street N	ind & Ponack		BRUSCA,	JOHN S	
AUG 1 0	2006 Washington, D			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
à				1631		
THADEN	ARTA			DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006	;	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED FEB 1 3 2006

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK

Bact Available Copy

4 1		OIPE			
6 .	r)	ZNO8	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		AUG 1 0 2006	09/422,804	SOUTHERN, EDI	WIN
	Office Action Summ	(%)	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TE - MAII INO DATE OF This o	PADEMART	John S. Brusca	1631	
Period fo		ommunication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM nsions of time may be available under the size of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of period for reply is specified above, the mail to reply within the set or extended perion	THE MAILING DA provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 this communication. aximum statutory period w d for reply will, by statute, e months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status					
1)	Responsive to communicatio	n(s) filed on 14 No	ovember 2005.		
	This action is FINAL .		action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in co	•	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is
			x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45		
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
4)🖂	Claim(s) 17-99 is/are pending	j in the application	I.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 40-	95 is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed	j.			
_	Claim(s) 17-26,38,39 and 96-				
	Claim(s) 27-37 is/are objecte				
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to	restriction and/or	election requirement.		
Applicati	on Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to	by the Examiner	•		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on	is/are: a)□ acce	pted or b) \square objected to by the E	xaminer.	
			rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See		
			on is required if the drawing(s) is object		
11)[_]	The oath or declaration is obje	cted to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	O-152.
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
			priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-	·(d) or (f).	
•	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ Non				
	1. Certified copies of the p				_
	and the same of th		have been received in Application		
	 Copies of the certified c Tapplication from the Interest 		ty documents have been received	in this National	Stage
* Se			f the certified copies not received	4	
	so the attached detailed Office	2 delion for a list of	the certified copies not received	1.	
\ttachment(s)				
) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary (F	PTO-413)	
) Notice	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1	view (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	e	450)
Paper l	ation Disclosure Statement(s) (P10-1 No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/8/05, 12/20/05</u> .	449 or PTO/SB/08)	6) Other:	tent Application (PTO-	-152)
Patent and Trac	domark Office		·		



Art Unit: 1631



DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This application has been reassigned to a new examiner.
- 2. Due to new grounds of rejection not necessitated by the applicant's amendments this is a non-final rejection.

Election/Restrictions

- 3. Claims 40-99, filed in the amendment filed 06 December 2000 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:
- 4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - 1. Claims 1-39 and 96-99 drawn to oligonucleotide arrays, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3.
 - Claims 40, 42, 43, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 57, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by attachment of presynthesized oligonucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 6
 - Claims 41, multiple dependent claims 44-56, and 58-62, drawn to a method of making an oligonucleotide array by in situ synthesis of oligonucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 25.3
 - 4. Claims 63-67, multiple dependent claim 70-86, 89, 90, and 95, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay for hybridization of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

5. Claims 68, 69, multiple dependent claims 70-86, and 87, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising all possible sequences, classified in class 435 subclass 6.

- Claim 88, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array comprising iterative hybridization with larger oligonucleotide applied samples, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
- 7. Claims 91-94, drawn to a method of using an oligonucleotide array to assay a nucleotide sequence of an applied sample, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- Inventions 1 and Inventions 2-3 are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 could be made by either the method of invention 2 or 3.
- 6. Inventions 1 and Inventions 4-7 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the array of invention 1 can be used in any of the methods of inventions 4-7.
- 7. Inventions 2-3 and Inventions 4-7 are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the

Art Unit: 1631

inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, inventions 2-3 are drawn to methods of making oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps, and inventions 4-7 are drawn to methods of using oligonucleotide arrays which comprise different steps and produce different results.

- 8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups 1-7 are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 10. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention of Invention 1, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 40-95 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Information Disclosure Statement

11. Many references in the Information Disclosure Statements filed 08 December 2005 and 20 December 2005 have not been considered because the references are not publications.

Double Patenting

12. The rejection for obviousness-type double patenting over U.S. Patent No. 6,054,270 in the Office action mailed 13 July 2005 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 28 August 2001.

Art Unit: 1631

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. An obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but an examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined claim is either anticipated by, or would be obvious

Art Unit: 1631

over, the reference claim(s). see, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

15. Claims 17, 20, 25, 26, and 39 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-42 of copending Application No. 10/115077. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending claims are either species of the instant claims or have only minor differences.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 17. Claims 17, 19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stavrianopoulos et al. (reference KB in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005)

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the array has a glass substrate. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides are attached to the support by a covalent linkage.

Art Unit: 1631

Regarding the limitations of claims 23 and 24, it is brought to the Applicant's attention that a product by process claim is examined for novelty and obviousness of the claimed product only, and that no consideration is given to the novelty or obviousness of the method of making the claimed product. See M.P.E.P. 2113.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 19. Claims 17, 18, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments there are at least 72 samples in the array.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the

Art Unit: 1631

samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show the number of wells that exist in conventional microtiter plates.

Cooke et al. shows microtiter plates that differ from the conventional plates by virtue of being made from disposable plastic. Cooke et al. shows in figure 1 a microtiter plate with an 8x12 matrix of wells for a total of 96 wells.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 96 well microtiter plate of Cooke et al. for the purpose of analyzing up to 96 samples in one array.

20. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Suggs et al.

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotides in the array are between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Stravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of conventional microtiter plates to contain the samples in columns 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows that the applied samples may be of small or high molecular weight in column 1, lines 29-30. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 5, lines 63-67 that oligonucleotides used to hybridize to the samples on the array should be at least 25 nucleotides in length to allow for stable hybridization with the complementary

Art Unit: 1631

nucleotides of the sample on the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show use of samples on an array of between 8 and 20 nucleotides in length.

Suggs et al. shows in the abstract, methods section on page 6613 and Table 1 the synthesis and use of oligonucleotide probes that are 15 nucleotides in length. Suggs et al. shows in figures 1 and 2 that such probes may be used to hybridize specifically to a complementary sequence.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the 15mer probes of Suggs et al. because Suggs et al. shows that oligonucleotides of that length are long enough to allow for specific hybridization and a functional equivalent to longer oligonucleotides, and further obvious because shorter oligonucleotides allow for reduced labor and cost for synthesis.

21. Claims 96, 98, and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to kits comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, and shows a microtiter substrate in column 12, lines 20-24. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows colorimetric assays of hybridization in column 6-7 and table 1. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show computer controlled scanners of colorimetric assays.

Art Unit: 1631

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

22. Claim 97 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above, and further in view of Caulfield et al.

The claims are drawn to a kit comprising arrays of oligonucleotides comprising at least 72 different known oligonucleotides at different positions and scanners for detecting hybridization to the array.

Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above does not show computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

Caulfield et al. shows in the abstract and throughout a computer controlled analysis of a microtiter assay result. Caulfield et al. shows in the methods section on page 207 that an automatic scanner/reader was used to determine the level of colored product in each well of a

Art Unit: 1631

microtiter assay, and further shows throughout the paper a computer mediated analysis of the results of the assay.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Cooke et al. as applied to claims 17, 18, and 38 above by use of the computer mediated automatic scanning and raw data analysis of Caulfield et al. to save manual labor of analyzing the results of a colorimetric microtiter assay.

23. Claims 17 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stavrianopoulos et al. in view of Molecular Biosystems Inc. (WO 85/01050, reference AF in the Information Disclosure Statement filed 08 December 2005).

The claims are drawn to arrays of oligonucleotides comprising different known oligonucleotides at different positions. In some embodiments the oligonucleotide is covalently linked to the support.

Sravrianopoulos et al. shows in column 1, lines 29-30, and column 5 an array of oligonucleotides, with a substrate that may be plastic or glass. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows in column 8, lines 40-45 that various (meaning different) polynucleotide samples may be present in the array. Stavrianopoulos et al. does not show covalent linkage of oligonucleotides to supports.

Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows covalent linkages of oligonucleotides to a solid support and use of such linked oligonucleotides for hybridization assays in pages 8-9, and 34-37.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hybridization assay of Stavrianopoulos et al. by use of the covalent linkage of Molecular Biosystems Inc. because Molecular Biosystems Inc. shows that

Art Unit: 1631

such covalent linkages are useful to tether hybridized polynucleotide duplexes for purification of the hybridized duplex in hybridization assays.

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 14 November 2005 regarding the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Those rejections of claims not reiterated in this Office action have been withdrawn. New grounds of rejection have been made over some claims. The applicants argue that Stavrianopoulos et al. uses the arrays for hybridization to probes, rather than using arrays of probes for hybridization to unknown samples. The intended use of the composition of Stavrianopoulos et al. is not relevant because Stavrianopoulos et al shows the claimed composition or makes obvious the claimed compositions in combination with other references as detailed above. Stavrianopoulos et al. shows use of known (and therefore predetermined) sequences on arrays. The applicants further argue that the samples of Stavrianopoulos et al are on different wells and are therefore on different surfaces, however a microtiter dish is a single surface comprising multiple depressions.

Allowable Subject Matter

25. Claims 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

26. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are

Art Unit: 1631

available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center at (800) 786-9199. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Brusca whose telephone number is 571 272-0714. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, PhD. can be reached on 571 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1631

Page 14

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

5. Burs 5 February 2006 John S. Brusca

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1631

jsb

_							TOIPS	\leq				
Sheet 1 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	<u> </u>	———	/ 5 . 	\rightarrow				
FORM PTO 1449 (m	•	RTMENT OF COMMERCE	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422	NO. 2,804	DEC 2 0 2005	88				
PATI	ENT AN	ID TRADEMARK OFFICE	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		· P	PADDUART!	5 CT				
((Use seve	eral sheets if necessary) to PTO: December 20, 2		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631						
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS								
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DAT APPROPRI					
RB	62	4,689,405	8/1987	Frank et al.								
Als	86	5,348,855	9/1994	Dattagupta et al.			 					
	FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS											
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	SER YES NO									
1965	61	1 526 708	9/1978	GB								
BB	98	0 119 573 A1	9/1994	EP								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertin	nent Pages, Etc.)							
	1	David Kitchin QC and between Oxford Gen March 22, 2001, Lon	ne Technology	ade, Affymetrix' Opening Su (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case i Kingdom.	ubmissions, in the nos. HC 1999 0	he United Kingd)2517, HC 1999	lom litigation 04645, pages	s 1-81,				
of the state of th	3	Bird & Bird, Notice to Affymetrix, case no.	Admit Facts, HC 1999 0464	in the United Kingdom litig 45, pages 1-5, January 28,	ation between (2000, London,	Oxford Gene Te United Kingdom	chnology (OG	iT) v.				
100	4	Richard Meade, Brist Kingdom litigation be June 22, 2000, Lond	etween Oxford	Defendant's Response to t I Gene Technology (OGT) v ngdom.	he Claimant's N v. Affymetrix, ca	Votice to Admit Fise no. HC 1999	Facts, in the U	Inited s 1-3,				
	5	Bristows, Particulars Technology (OGT) v	of Independer . Affymetrix, ca	intly Valid Claims, in the Un ase no. HC 1999 04645, pa	ited Kingdom lif ages 1-2, June ;	tigation betweer 22, 2000, Londo	n Oxford Gene on, United King	; gdom.				
EXAMINER		h		DATE CONSIDER	RED C G. I.	20	27					

									
• Sheet 2 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCL	OSURE STATEMENT			/017	E
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERCE	E	ATTY DOG 99_1174	CKET NO.	SERIAL 09/422		DEC 20	2005
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICATE				THE PROPERTY.	ARM COP
Date :		veral sheels if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DA	ATE r 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	The same of the sa	
			U	J.S. PATENT C	DOCUMENTS				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE APPROPRIA	
	<u></u>		FOR	SIGN BAYES	TOOMIENTS	<u>.</u>			<u> </u>
	7				T DOCUMENTS	01400	5::00:400	TO A LIGI ATIV	
	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATIO YES	NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Aut	thor, Title, Date, Perline	ent Pages, Etc.)			
	6	Richard Meade, Bris					ation between		
		Oxford Gene Technol United Kingdom.), 2000, London	1,
			- <u></u>				·		
	7	Bird & Bird, Stateme v. Affymetrix, case n							GT)
	8	Bird & Bird, Re-Re-F Oxford Gene Techno United Kingdom.	Re-Amended Fology (OGT) v.	*articulars . Affymetri	of Objections, in t x, case no. HC 19	the United King 199 04645, page	dom litigation t es 1-5, March 1	between 13, 2001, Londo	n,
-6	-				\				
lej.	9	Alastair Wilson QC, Technology (OGT) v Kingdom.							1
4-	 				\longrightarrow				
no.	10	Bird & Bird, Amende Technology (OGT) v. Kingdom.	d Particulars of Affymetrix, ca	of Infringen ase no. HC	nent, in the United 3 1999 02517, paç	Kingdom litiga ges 12-14, Sep	ation between (tember 1, 2000	Oxford Gene), London, Unite	ed
2	11	Richard Meade, Defe between Oxford Gen London, United King	ne Technology	nterclaim c	of the First and Se Affymetrix, case n	cond Defendar io. HC 1999.02	ts, in the Unite 517, pages 1-6	ed Kingdom litig i, August 6, 199	ation 9,
	12	Richard Meade, Ame litigation between Ox 15, 2001, London, Ur	dord Gene Ted	chnology (0	ections of the First OGT) v. Affymetria	t and Second D x, case no. HC	efendants, in the 1999 02517, p	he United Kingo ages 21-37, Jar	dom nuary
								\	
EXAMINER		B. Bruses			DATE CONSIDERE	D 5 Fel	way 20	10 6	

Sheet 3 of 17	•		INFORM/	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	T		OIPE	\			
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC	`E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		NEC B.	(80 gg)			
PA	ATENT AN OF REFERE	ND TRADEMARK OFFICI ENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		PATTER	ACC 2 0 7005				
	(Use sev	veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	PHOEMART	-			
			υ	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA				
			FOR	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		-					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSU YES				
								<u> </u>			
								ļ			
	·										
				<u> </u>				<u> </u>			
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertin	nent Pages, Etc.)						
	13	Manches, Re-Re-Re- Oxford Gene Technol Kingdom.	∋-Amended Re lology (OGT) v.	eply and Defence of Counte v. Affymetrix, case no. HC 19	erclaim, in the U 999 02517, pp.	nited Kingdom 38-46, March 2	litigation beto 2000, Oxford,	ween , United			
, of	14	Dr. David R. Bentley Technology (OGT) v London, United King	v. Affymetrix, ca	f Expert Report, in the Unite case nos. HC 1999 04645 at	d Kingdom litigand HC 1999 02	ation between 0 517, pages 1-3	Oxford Gene 18, January 3	0, 2001,			
mela	15	Oxford Gene Techno	ology (OGT) v.	ort of Dr. David Bentley, in the Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1 condon, United Kingdom.	ne United Kingd 1999 04645 and	om litigation be J HC 1999 025	etween 17, pages 1A	1F,			
26	16	Oxford Gene Techno	avid R. Bentley, Annex 1 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between d Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-17, ry 30, 2001, London, United Kingdom.								
	17	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Expert Report of Dr. David B . Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1 Kingdom.	lentley, in the N 1999 04645 and	nited Kingdom PC 1999 0251	litigation bet 17, pages 1-2	ween ?,			
EXAMINER		K. Bruse	<u> </u>	DATE CONSIDERE	ED T Feli	man 71	mul				

									\sqrt{c}	SIPE	
Sheet 4 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCL	OSURE STATEMENT	<u> </u>					8
FORM PTO 1449 .U.S	•	RTMENT OF COMMERCE	<u> </u>	ATTY DO 99_117	CKET NO.		SERIAL (NO. ,804	DEC	2 0 2005	8)
PA	TENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE INCES CITED BY APPLICAN	Ē	APPLICA Edwin S	NT Southern				No m	DEMARKO	
Date S		eral sheets if necessary) I to PTO: December 20, 2	005	FILING D. October	ATE 22, 1999			GROUP 1631			
			U.:	S. PATENT !	DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	C	ASS	SUBCLA	ss	FILING DA	
			FORE	IGN PATEN	IT DOCUMENTS			•			
	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CI	ASS	SUBCLA	ss	TRANSLA YES	ATION NO
											•
	<u></u>	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (//	ncludina Aut	hor, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Page	s. Etc.)				
	18	Oc. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymetri:	x, case nos. HC 1	entley, 1999 04	in the Ur 645 and	nited King HC 1999	dom litig 02517,	gation bet pages 1-2	ween
1	19	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymetrix	k, case nos. HC 1	entley, 999 04	in the Ur 645 and	nited King HC 1999	dom litig 02517,	gation beto pages 1-4	ween I,
ellesh	20	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) 📐	Affymetrix	c, case nos. HC 1	entley, 999 04	in the Ur 645 and	nited King HC 1999	dom litig 02517, j	gation bety pages 1-1	ween 2,
9 14	21	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v.	Affymetrix	r, caše nos. HC 1	entley, 999 04	in the Un 645 and	nited Kingo HC 1999	dom litig 02517, į	gation betw pages 1-8	veen ,
	22	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v∴	Affymetrix	ort of Dr. David Be c, case nos. HC 19	entley, 999-046	in the Un	ited Kingo HC 1999	iom litig D2517, p	pation betw pages 1-2	veen
	23	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. /	Affymetrix	ort of Dr. David Be , case nos. HC 19	entley, i 999 046	n the Un 345 and I	ited Kingo	lom litig)2517, p	ation betwo	/een
EXAMINER	10	16. Bruse	ı		DATE CONSIDERE	5 5	Fale	hunes	70	06	

				·					
Sheet 5 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE S	TATEMENT			OIPE	7
FORM PTO 1449	,) RTMENT OF COMMERC	F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422	004	DEC 2 0 2005	8
P/	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE	Ē	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			PATE	المن مع	\$
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 199	9		GROUP 1631	HADENA	7
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMEN	ıts				*
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	C	LASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA	
				·					
	.	_ 	FORI	EIGN PATENT DOCUM	ENTS		<u> </u>	1	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY		LASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	ATION NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (ncluding Author, Title, C	Pate, Pertinent Page	es, Etc.)	•		
	24	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techni January 30, 2001, L	ology (OGT) v.	Affymetrix, case n	. David Bentley los. HC 1999 0	, in the U 4645 and	nited Kingdom HC 1999 025	litigation bet 17, pages 1-1	veen 2,
	25	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, L	ęlogy (OGT) v.	Affymetrix, case n	r. David Bentle os. HC 1999 0	y, in the l 4645 and	Jnited Kingdor HC 1999 025	m litigation be 17, pages 1-1	tween 4,
,	26	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) _v .	Affymetrix, case n	r. David Bentle os. HC 1999 04	y, in the U 1645 and	Jnited Kingdor HC 1999 025	n litigation be 17, pages 1-5	tween
uleske	27	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymetrix, case no	r. David Bentle os. HC 1999 04	y, in the U 1645 and	Jnited Kingdor HC 1999 025	n litigation bei	lween
R CV	28.	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	Affymetrix, case no	r. David Bentle os. HC 1999 04	/, in the U	Inited Kingdon HC 1999 025	n litigation bel 17, pages 1-8	ween
	29	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v	Affymetrix, case no	David Bentley Ds. HC 1999 04	in the U	Inited Kingdon HC 1999 0251	n litigation bet 17, pages 1-8,	ween
	30	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	logy (OGT) v. /	Affymetrix, case no	David Bentley s: HC 1999 04	, in the U 645 and I	nited Kingdom HC 1999 0251	n litigation bet 7, pages 1-4,	ween
EXAMINER		oll. Brus	er	DATE CO	ONSIDERED 5	Fel	may à	7006	

							_				
. Sheet 6 of 17	•		INFORMA	ATION DISCL	L'OSURE STATEMENT	T			4	PE	
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERCE	:E	ATTY DO:	OCKET NO. 74		SERIAL I 09/422			an 2005 m	
PA	ATENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICAL Edwin S	ANT Southern				A DE		
Date {		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DA	PATE or 22, 1999			GROUP 1631	de	TRABEAR	
			U		DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	C	CLASS	SUBCLAS	SS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE	
									I		
			FOR	EIGN PATEN	NT DOCUMENTS						
	<u></u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CI	CLASS	SUBCLAS	ss	TRANSLATION YES NO	
		<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u></u>		<u></u>					
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Aut	thor, Title, Date, Pertind	nent Page	es, Etc.)				
	31	Dr. David R. Bentley Oxford Gene Technol January 30, 2001, Lo	iology (OGT) v.	r. Affymetri:	ix, case nos. HC 1	Bentley 1999 04	y, in the l 4645 and	Jnited King HC 1999 (jdom lil 02517,	tigation between pages 1-38,	
	32	Oxford Gene Techno	David R. Bentley, Annex 17 to Expert Report of Dr. David Bentley, in the United Kingdom litigation between ford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 04645 and HC 1999 02517, pages 1-4, mary 30, 2001, Candon, United Kingdom.								
	33	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OOT) v.	. Affymetrix	ix, case nos. HC 1	Bentley 1999 04	/, in the L 1645 and	Jnited King HC 1999 (Jdom lit 02517,	tigation between pages 1-2,	
nellesh	34	Dr. David R. Bentley, Oxford Gene Techno January 30, 2001, Lo	ology (OGT) v.	. Affymeltçix	ix, case nos. HC 1	Bentley 1999 04	/, in the L 1645 and	Jnited King HC 1999 (Jdom lit 02517,	tigation between pages 1-4,	
no	35	Prof. Wolfgang Pfleio Technology (OGT) v. 19, 2001, Konstanz, o	/. Affymetrix, ca	Report and ase nos. H	I Annex 1, in the I IC 1999 04645 an	United I	Kingdom 1999 025	litigation b	petweer 1-40 ar	n Oxford Gene nd 1-2, January	
	36	Dr. David B. Wallace between Oxford Gene 1-55, January 18, 200	ne Technology	' (OGT) v. A	Affymetrix, case n	, P.E., F	PH.D., in 2 1999 04	the United 1645 and H	Kingdo	om litigation 9 02517, pages	
	37	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxt pages 1-25, January	xford Gene Tec	chnology (6	(OGT) v. Affymetri:	en Wall ix, case	lace, P.E. nos. HC	., PH.D., in 1999 046	the Ur 45 and	nited Kingdom I HC 1999 02517,	
·	38	Dr. David B. Wallace, litigation between Oxf pages 1-24, January	dord Gene Tec	chnology (C	OGT) v. Affymetrix	en Walli ix, case	ace, P.E. nos. HC	, PH.D., in ; 1999 046	the Ur	nited Kingdom HC 1999 02517,	
EXAMINER	lo	K. Bruse	ı		DATE CONSIDERE		FEL	runka	20	06	

Sheet 7 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCL	OSURE STATEMENT			
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DO 99_117	CKET NO.	SERIAL 09/422		OIPE 46
P.A	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICAI	E	APPLICA Edwin S	NT Southern			DEC 2 0 2005
Date :		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING D October	ATE r 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	TRADEMAN OF
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS		·	
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
	1		FORE	T T	T DOCUMENTS		<u> </u>	I
	-	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	'	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	<u> </u>							
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	Including Aut	thor, Title, Date, Pertiner	nt Pages, Etc.)		
	39	Dr. Paul H. Silverma litigation between O pages 1-2 and 1-8,	xford Gene Te	chnology	(OGT) v. Affymetrix			ited Kingdom and HC 1999 02517,
	40	Prof. Edwin M. Sout between Oxford Ser Oxford, United King	ne Technology					
de de	41	Prof. Edwin M. Sout Kingdom litigation be pages 1-14, May 1,	etween Oxford	Gene Tec	chnology (OGT) v. i	nent of Edwin Affymetrix, cas	Mellor Southe se nos. HC 19	rn, in the United 99 04645 ,
pulle	43	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation be pages 1-41, May 1, 2	etween Oxford	Gene Tèc	thnology (OGT) v. /	nent of Edwin Affymetrix, cas	Mellor Southe se nos. HC 19	rn, in the United 99 04645,
20	44	Prof. Edwin M. South Kingdom litigation be pages 1-58, May 1, 2	etween Oxford	Gene Tec	thnology (OGN) v. A	nent of Edwin Affymetrix, cas	Mellor Southe se nos. HC 199	m, in the United 99 04645,
	45	Prof. Edwin M. South between Oxford Gen 2001, Oxford, United	ie Technology (ess State (OGT) v. A	ment of Edwin Mell Affymetrix, case no	for Southern, i s. HC 1999 04	n the United K 1645, pages 1-	Cingdom litigation -13, January 22,
	46	Prof. Edwin M. South litigation between Ox 22, 2001, Oxford, Un	ford Gene Tec	o Fifth Wi	tness Statement of OGT) v. Affymetrix,	Edwin Mellor case nos. HC	Southern, in to 1999 04645,	he United Kingdom pages 1-7, January
EXAMINER	ll	Job. Bu	my		DATE CONSIDERED	5 Fel	Perusery	2006

- Sheet 8 of 17	•	_	INFORMA	TION DISCL'OSURE STATEME	NT	/0	40
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIA 09/42	L NO. 2,804 DE	EC 2 0 2005 (4)
P.	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Ē	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		BARRA	4 TRADEMPT OF
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			500	FIGN DATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT		EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	21.00		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
	L	<u> </u>	l				L
	T			Including Author, Title, Date, Per			
	47	Peter Jay Coassin, Oxford Gene Techn Fullerion, California	ology (OGT) v.	ment of Peter Jay Coassii . Affymetrix, case nos. HC	n, in the United I C 1999 02517, pa	Kingdom litigatio ages 1-4, Janua	n between ry 22, 2001,
	48	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, Oxford Gene Techn United Kingdom.	Witness State ology (OGT) v.	ment of Timothy Stephen Affymetrix, case nos. HC	Fell, in the Unito 1999 02517, pa	ed Kingdom litiga ages 1-11, Janua	ation between ary 18, 2001, Oxford,
Ę	49	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, between Oxford Ger Oxford, United Kingo	ne Technology	tness Statement of Timotl (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	hy Stephen Fell, e nos. HC 1999	in the United Ki 02517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 5, January 18, 2001,
miles	50	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, between Oxford Ger Oxford, United Kingo	ne Technology	tness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	ny Stephen Fell, e nos. HC 1999	in the United Ki 02517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 6, January 18, 2001,
) eu	51	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, a between Oxford Ger Oxford, United Kingo	ne Technology	iness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	ny Stephen Fell, e nos. HC 1999	in the United Ki 02517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 8, January 18, 2001,
	52	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen 2001, Oxford, United	e Technology	ness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	ny Stephen Fell, nos. HC 1999 (in the United Kii 02517, pages 1-	ngdom litigation 11, January 18,
	53	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen Oxford, United Kingd	e Technology	ness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	ny Stephen Fell, nos. HC 1999 (in the United Kir 02517, pages 1-2	ngdom litigation 2, January 18, 2001,
	54	Dr. Timothy S. Fell, A between Oxford Gen 2001, Oxford, United	e Technology	ness Statement of Timoth (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case	y Stephen Fell, nos. HC 1999 0	in the United Kir 2517, pages 1-1	ngdom litigation 11, January 18,
EXAMINER	la	S. Bruss	-	DATE CONSIDER	RED 56	elesure	2006

			\								
• Sheet 9 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	ī						
			·-	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174			01	PES			
PA	ATENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			DEC 20	7 2005			
	(Use sev	veral sheets if necessary)		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	MADEM	AMEN COPPE			
	FORM PTO 1449 (modified) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE LIST OF REFERENCES CETIED BY APPLICANT(S) (Uso several sheets if necessary) Date Submitted to PTO: December 20, 2005 U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS TEXAMINER INTIAL DOCUMENT DATE COUNTRY DOCUMENT DATE COUNTRY CLASS SUBCLASS FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS OTHER DOCUMENTS OTHER DOCUMENTS OTHER DOCUMENTS OTHER DOCUMENTS) (Indiading Author, Tithe, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.) Steward L. Huxley, Witness Statement of Stewart Leonard Huxley, in the United Kingdom little Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-2, Januar United Kingdom. 56 Martin G. Johnson, Witness Statement of Martin George Johnson, in the United Kingdom little Country United Kingdom. 57 Ekins R., "Multi-analyte immunoassay", Journal of Pharmaceutical & Biomedical Analysis, Vinder Statement of Martin George Johnson with the United Kingdom little Kingdom. 57 Ekins R., "Multi-analyte immunoassay", Journal of Pharmaceutical & Biomedical Analysis, Vinder Statement of Martin George Johnson with the United Kingdom little Kingdom. 58 Kimura et al., "An Immobilized Enzyme Membrane Fabrication Method using an Ink Jet Noza 4, pp. 41-52, 1988. 59 Geysen et al., "Strategies for epitope analysis using peptide synthesis", Journal of Immunolo 102, pp. 259-274, 1987. Monaco et al., "Human Genome Linking With Cosmids and Yeast Artificial Chromosomes", a pp. 90, 1989.										
					CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D				
			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS							
			1		CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL/ YES	ATION ON			
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Author, Title, Date, Pertir	nent Pages, Etc.)						
Mich	55	Stewart L. Huxley, W Oxford Gene Techno	Vitness Statem	ment of Stewart Leonard Hu	uxley, in the Unit	ed Kingdom lit ges 1-2, Janua	igation betwe ary 8, 2001, C	en)xford,			
dou	56	Oxford Gene Techno	G. Johnson, Witness Statement of Martin George Johnson, in the United Kingdom litigation between the Gene Technology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, case nos. HC 1999 02517, pages 1-7, January 19, 2001, Oxford, I Kingdom.								
JEB	57	Ekins R., "Multi-anal 155-168, 1989.	yte immunoas	say", Journal of Pharmacer	utical & Biomedi	ical Analysis, \	/o. 7, No. 2, p	pp.			
SP	58	Kimura et al., "An Im 4, pp. 41-52, 1988.	mobilized Enz	:yme Membrane Fabrication	n Method using	an Ink Jet Noz	zzle", Biosens	sors, Vol.			
86	59	Geysen et al., "Strate 102, pp. 259-274, 19	egies for epitor	pe analysis using peptide s	synthesis", Journ	nal of Immunol	logical Metho	ds, Vol.			
18/2	60	Monaco et al., "Huma p. 90, 1989.	an Genome Lin	nking With Cosmids and Yo	east Artificial Ch	romosomes",	abstract from	ı CSHS,			
V, brough	63	Dr. Edwin Southern, 0 619 321, pp. 1-17,	Statutory Decl Oct. 1999, Kid	laration of Dr. Edwin South	em, in the Oppo	sition Proceed	lings against	EP No.			
Sh	64	Ekins R., "Why we sh on Molecular Probes	nould move too	wards non-isotopic immuno and Medical Applications, p	passay?", Prese	ntation at Inter I-13, 1988, Flo	national Sym rence, Italy.	ıposium			
JB	65	Lysov et al., "A New I Oligonucleotides", Do	Method for Der oklady Biocher	etermining the DNA Nucleoti mistry, Vol. 303, pp. 436-43	ide Sequence b 38, Nov-Dec 198	y Hybridizatior 38.	ı with				
EXAMINER	Till	5 Brust		DATE CONSIDER	ED 5 Golina	man 2006					

Sheet 10 of 17			INFORMA	ATION DISC	LOSURE STATEME	NT			OIPE	
	.S. DEPAI	RTMENT OF COMMERC		99_117	OCKET NO. 74		SERIAL I 09/422		Dt. 2 0 2005	200
	OF REFER	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA veral sheets if necessary)		APPLIC/ Edwin	ANT Southern			, les		**
Date		d to PTO: December 20,	2005	FILING D	PATE of 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
			U	.S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CU	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE I	
			FOR	EIGN PATEI	NT DOCUMENTS			_		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CIA	Ass	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES N	N IO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Au	thor, Title, Date, Per	tinent Pages,	Etc.)			
	66	Professor Edwin Solitigation between C 2000, Kidlington, U	outhern, Witnes	ss Statem	ent of Professor	Edwin Me	llor Sou	thern, in the U	nited Kingdom p. 1-40, January	1
	67	Bird and Bird, Notice Gene Technology,	e of Opposition op. 1-15, Oct. 1	n, in the O 1999, Lond	pposition Proce don, United King	edings agadom.	ainst EP	No. 0 619 321	filed by Oxford	
. 4	68	Dr. Edwin Southern 0 619 321, pp. 1-17	, Statutory Dec , Oct. 1999, Ox	laration o dord, Unit	f Dr. Edwin Sou ed Kingdom.	thern, in th	е Орро	sition Proceedi	ngs against EP	No
uller	6 6	Morris, Nichols, Ars States litigation beto Delaware, CA No. 9	veen Oxford G	ene Lechi	nology (OGT) v.	Affymetrix	CUSD	d Amended An istrict Court for	oswer, in the Uni the District of	ite
no pa	70	Dale Davis, Expert I v. Affymetrix, U.S. D Delaware.	Report of Dale istrict Court for	Davis, in the Distri	he United State ct of Delaware,	s litigation CA No. 99	betwee 9-348, p	n Oxford Gene b. 1-37, August	Technology (Od 2000, Wilmingt	GT ton
	71	Grant Morgan, Expe (OGT) v. Affymetrix, Atascadero, Califorr	U.S. DISTRICT C	ant Morga ourt for th	n, in the United e District of Dela	States litiç aware, CA	gation be No. 99-	etween Oxford 348, pp. 1-15,	Gene Technolog August 2000,	gy
	72	Dr. Elias Corey, Exp Technology (OGT) v 2000, Wilmington, D	. Anymetik, U.	r. Elias Ja S. District	mes Corey, in t Court for the R	he United istrict of D	States li elaware	tigation between, CA No. 99-34	en Oxford Gene 8, pp. 1-10, Aug	jus
	73	Dr. James Wetmur, Technology (OGT) v 2000, Wilmington, D	. Anymetrix, U.	of Dr. Jam S. District	es G. Wetmur, Court for the Di	in the Unit	ed State	es litigation beh CA No. 99-34	ween Oxford Ge 8, pp. 1-29, Aug	ne Jus
	74	Morris, Nichols, Arsh OGT's Motion for Sur Technology (OGT) v. September 2000, Wi	Affymetrix, U.S	S. District	IIIV IN INP LINIE	a States I	lica of bear	hab	4 ^	to
MINER	1	A.			DATE CONSIDER		~ .		,	_

Sheet 11 of 17			INFORM/	ATION DISCL	LOSURE STATEMEN	т		OIP		
FORM PTO 1449 U.S		RTMENT OF COMMERCI	F	ATTY DO 99_117	OCKET NO. 74		RIAL NO. 9/422,804	DEC. 2.0.1	₹ \ 200c	
PA	TENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICA Edwin S	ANT Southern			A STATE OF THE STA	1005 (A)	
Date S	•	veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING D October	DATE or 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	WADEMI	·//	
			U	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPE		
			FOR	SIGN PATER	NT DOCUMENTS					
	1	DOCUMENT	DATE		COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA	TION	
	-	NUMBER	DATE	 	COUNTRY		, 30000.00	YES	NO	
		OTHER	DOCHMENT(S)	Uncluding Au	thor, Tille, Date, Pertir	nent Pages. Etc				
	75	Di James Wetmur, Summary Judgment Affymetrix, U.S. Dist California.	Declaration of t of Validity, in	f James G the United	. Wetmur in Supp d States litigation	port of Affyri between O	netrix's Opposition	ology (OGT) v.		
	76	Oxford Gene Techno	James Wetmur, Expert Rebuttal Report of Dr. James G. Wetmur, in the United States litigation between ford Gene Vechnology (OGT) v. Affymetrix, U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 99-348, pp. 5, September 2000, Palo Alto, California.							
٤.	77	Dr. Martin Adelman Technology (OGT) v 2000, Washington, E	Affymetrix, U							
public	78	Dr. Elias Corey, Dec Summary Judgment Affymetrix, U.S. Distr Massachusetts.	of Validity, in	the United	States litigation	between Ox	xford Gene Techn	ology (OGT) v.		
200	79	Pretrial Order Exhibit Affymetrix, U.S. Distr Delaware.	s 1-5 and 12- ict Court for th	13 in the he District	United States litig of Delaware, CA	gation betwe No. 99-348	en Oxford Gene , pp. 1-110, Octob	Technology (Od per 2000, Wilmi	GT) v. ington,	
	80	Transcript of Markma Affymetrix, U.S. Distr Delaware.	in Hearing, in ict Court for th	the United ne District	States litigation of Delaware, CA	between Ox No. 99-348	xford Gene Techn , pp. 1-149, Octob	ology (OGT) v. per 2000, Wilmi	ington,	
Jes	81	Wada A., Abstracts of Sequencing, pp. 2-11	of Presentation July 7-9, 19	ns at Interr 87, Okaya	national Worksho ima, Japan.	p on Autom	natic and High Spe	ed DNA Base		
Jes Jes	82	Wallace et al., "Hybri base pair mismatch",	dization of syr Nucleic Acids	nthetic olig Research	jodeoxyribonucle h, Vol. 6, No. 11,	otides to ph pp. 3543-3	ii and 174 DNA: th 557, 1979.	e effect of sing	ile	
AB	83	Uwe Maskos, "A nove Oxford, pp. 2-161, Ne	el method of new College, Ox	ucleic acid xford, 1991	d sequence analy	rsis", Masko	s Thesis submitte	ed to University	of	
AMINER	V	B. Bruser			DATE CONSIDER	ED J Fe	bruses 200	76		

Sheet 12 of 17			NEODMA	TION DISCLO	CHOE STATEMENT					
FORM PTO 1449 (•	RTMENT OF COMMERC		ATTY DOC: 99_1174		SERIAL I 09/422		OIPE	40	
PA [*]	TENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICAT	E	APPLICAN Edwin Sc				DEC 2 0 201	15	
Date S		eral sheets if necessary) I to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DAT			GROUP	THAP BUP		
			U.	.S. PATENT DO	DCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA		
			FORI	EIGN PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	CC	OUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NO NO	
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Autho	or, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages, Etc.)				
XB	84	Bannworth, W. et al Support", DNA, Vol.	., "A System fo	or the Simul	taneous Chemic		Different DNA	Fragments o	n Solid	
J83	85		ohrmann, R. et al., "New Solid Supports for DNA Synthesis", Fourth Annual Congress for Recombinant DNA esearch, p. 122, 1984.							
ASB	8\$	Goldkorn, T. et al., " Application for hybrid Research, Vo. 14, N	dization-restric	tion analysi	is and for in vitro	or covalent atta synthesis of Di	chment of DN NA probes", N	A to cellulose lucleic Acids	:	
183	88	Duncan, C. et al., "A Oligonucleotides", A	ffinity Chroma nalytical Bioch	tography of nemistry, Vo	a Sequence-spe b. 169, pp. 104-10	ecific DNA Bindi 08, 1988.	ing Protein Us	sing Teflon-lin	ked	
16	89	Voss et al., "A simple matrix", Biochemical	e and efficient Society Trans	method for sactions, 16	covalently attach 5th meeting, Lon	ning oligonucleo don, pp. 367-30	otides to a cel 58, 1987.	lulose suppor		
H63	90	Nicholls, P. et al., "N Vol. 3, pp. 122-135,	ucleic Acid An 1989.	alysis by Sa	andwich Hybridiz	ation", Journal	of Clinical Lat	poratory Analy	rsis,	
16	84	Wallace, R. et al., "T oligonucleotides of m 879-894, 1981.	he use of synt nixed sequence	hetic oligon e to rabbit b	ucleotides as hyl peta-globin DNA"	bridization prob , Nucleic Acids	es. II. Hybridi Research, Vo	zation of bl. 9, No. 4, pp).	
7	92	File wrapper of S.N.	07/593,589 no	w abandon	ed. filing o	dute 020	utuber 19	90, Oattag	upta	
no cop!	rel	et,al.								
JBB	93	File wrapper of S.N.	07/772,625 ma 04 octobe	aturing into	US 5,348,855 on	September 19	94 to Dattagu	pta et al. _j		
EXAMINER	all	3. Bruses	-		DATE CONSIDERED	I Fels	wary 5	mol		

•				1			7 %
Sheet 13 of 17	·····		INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	<u>T</u>		80%
FORM PTO 1449 () RTMENT OF COMMERC	ìF.	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		DEC 2 0 2005
PA'	ATENT AN	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			PADEMANTE
	(Use sev	veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2		FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
			U	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		<u> </u>	
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS		·	
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	Including Author, Title, Date, Pertine	nent Pages, Etc.)		-
JED	94	ı	new linkage for	or solid phase synthesis of o		", Nucleic Acid	ls Research, Vol. 13,
183	95	Kremsky, J. et al., "I at the 5' terminus", I	mmobilization (Nucleic Acids F	of DNA via oligonucleotides Research, Vol. 15, No. 7, pp	s containing an p. 2891-2909, 19	aldehyde or ca	arboxylic acid group
NS5	96	Wolf, S. et al., "Rapi Research, Vol. 15, N	d hybridization	n kinetics of DNA attached to 1-2926, 1987.	to submicron late	ex particles", N	Nucleic Acids
NB	97	Atkinson, T., "A conv of mRNA", Nucleic A	venient procedi Acids Research	lure for the synthesis of olig n, Vol. 16, No. 13, p. 6232,	jodeoxyribonuck 1988.	eotide affinity (columns for isolation
7	99	Court Transcript of T v. Mergen Ltd et al., Wilmington, Delawar	U.S. District Co	torial, in the United States li court for the District of Delaw	itigation between ware, CA No. 02	n Oxford Gene ?-1695, pp. 1-7	: Technology (OGT) '2, December 2003,
, 0	100	Blank Rome LLP, OC (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd 2003, Wilmington, De	d et al., U.S. Dis	gy Tutorial, in the United Sta strict Court for the District o	ates litigation be of Delaware, CA	etween Oxford No. 02-1695,	Gene Technology pp. 1-28, December
publishe	101	States litigation between	veen Oxford Ger	en, Ltd.'s Slide Presentation ene Technology (OGT) v. Mo 1-11, December 2003, Wilm	fergen Ltd et al	. U.S. District C	utorial, in the United Court for the District
o ou	102	the United States litig	gation between	tech Laboratories Slide Pre n Oxford Gene Technology (-1695, pp. 1-33, December	(OGT) v. Merger	n Itdetal U.S	S. District Court for
	103	Kirkland & Ellis LLP, I between Oxford Gene No. 02-1695, pp. 1-6,	ie Technology (6	ns Coie LLP enclosing OGT (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., I hicago, Illinois.	rs Claim Terms U.S. District Co	, in the United urt for the Dist	States litigation rict of Delaware, CA
EXAMINER	1.0	& Buset		DATE CONSIDERE	D = Falu	7/	011

Sheet 14 of 17			INFORM	MATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	NT		100
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC		ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422	2,804	0100
PA	ATENT AN OF REFERE	IND TRADEMARK OFFICE SENCES CITED BY APPLICAN	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		3	DEC 2 U 2005
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	FABENME
			<u> </u>	U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF
			FOF	REIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION
	+	NUMBER			-		YES NO
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	(Including Author, Title, Date, Pert	dinent Pages, Etc.)		<u> </u>
	104	Perkins Coie LLP, N between Oxford Ger	Mergen Ltd.'s (ne Technology	Claim Terms and Proposed by (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et a Menlo Park, California.	d Construction, in	the United State	ates litigation strict of Delaware,
	105	Dr. Paul Purdue, Exp Gene Technology (C pp. 1-10, Ma) 2004,	OGT) v. Merge	f Paul Edward Purdue Ph.C en Ltd et al., U.S. District C IY.	D., in the United (States litigation ict of Delaware	between Oxford CA No. 02-1695
	106	Dr. Paul Purdue, Exp Gene Technology C pp. 1-13, June 2004	OGT) v. Merge	f Paul Edward Purdue Ph.C en Ltd et al., U.S. District C VY.)., in the United Sourt for the Distr	States litigation ict of Delaware	between Oxford , CA No. 02-1695
Isker	107	Technology Ltd's First	rst and Second v. Mergen Ltd e	Defendant Mergen Ltd.'s The de	the United States	s litigation between	veen Oxford Gene
900	108	between Oxford Gen	ne Technology	echnology Ltd.'s Claim Con (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al 4. Wilmington, Delaware.	istruction Brief, ir I., U.S. District C	the United Sta	ates litigation trict of Delaware,
200	109	litigation between Ox	xford Gene Te	Mergen Limited's Opening (echnology (OGT) v. Mergen -37, July 2004, Wilmington,	n Ltd et al U.S. [on Brief, in the District Court fo	United States or the District of
	110	litigation between Ox	of United State xford Gene Tec	Mergen Limited's Reply in S les Patent NO 6,054,270 P echnology (OGN) v. Mergen 9, August 2004, Wilmington	Pursuant to 35 U.: Ltd et al. U.S. F	S.C. 112 in the	e United States
	111	Support of its Motion Pursuant to 35 U.S.C	for Summary . C. 112, in the U	Declaration of Norbert Stahl Judgment of Invalidity of C United States litigation betw strict of Delaware, CA No.(Claim 1 of United ween Oxford Gen	States Patent I	NO. 6,054,270
XAMINER	Ja	S. Bruser	/	DATE CONSIDER	RED T Fel	unary 2	noh

Sheet 15 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN		6	8. M				
FORM PTO 1449		RTMENT OF COMMERC	ε	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/422		DEC 20 200	S OFFI			
	F REFERI	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	_	APPLICANT Edwin Southern			STEMPS TRA	SEAN TO SEAN THE SEAN			
Date S		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631					
			U.:	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPR				
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	γ		T				
	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	TION NO			
	· · · · · ·	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages, Etc.)						
	112	Construction Briefing	ank Rome LLP, Oxford Gene Technology's Claim Construction Brief In Response to Mergen's Claim instruction Briefing, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et , U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-118, August 2004, Wilmington, laware.								
	113	between Oxford\Gen	Order and Memorandum Opinion of the U.S. District Court on Claim Construction, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. District Court for the District of Delaware, CA No. 02-1695, pp. 1-20, September 2004, Wilmington, Delaware.								
y o y	114	between Oxford Gen	ie∖i echnology (f the U.S. District Court on (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., 004, Wilmington, Delaware	U.S. District Co	, in the United ourt for the Dis	States litigatio	n re, CA			
6/13	115	between Oxford Gen	e Lechnology (f the U.S. District Court on (OGT) v. Mergen Ltd et al., 004, Wilmington, Delaware	U.S. District Co	ment, in the U	nited States liti trict of Delawa	igation re, CA			
no on	116	States litigation between	ennology Limin een Oxford Gel	ergen Limited's Motion for F ed's Motion for Partial Sum ne Technology (OGT) v. Mo -18, December 2004, Wilm	mary Judgmeni ergen Ltd et al	t of Infringeme . U.S. District (nt in the Unite	d			
,	117	Reconsideration, in the	he United State	hnology Limited's Oppositions litigation between Oxford Delaware, CA No. 02-1695	Gene Technol	oay (OGT) v. f	Mernen I td at	al.,			
	118	Court's Order, in the t	Jnited States III	rgen Limited's Reply in Sup tigation between Oxford Ge vare, CA No. 02-1695, pp.	ene Technology	(OGD v Mor	aga i tal at al	110			
	119	Blank Rome LLP, Lett Technology (OGT) v. January 2005, Wilmin	Mergen Lia et a	rdan re claim terms, in the al., U.S. District Court for the	United States li ne District of De	tigation betwe laware, CA No	en Oxford Ger b. 02-1695, pp.	ne 1-2,			
XAMINER	la	B. Grusia		DATE CONSIDERED	5 Fel	waser 21	2016				

Sheet 16 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT_						
FORM PTO 1449		n) ARTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422		OFF	TOS		
	F REFER	IND TRADEMARK OFFIC		APPLICANT Edwin Southern				DEC 201	PFFIC SA		
Date		ed to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631	Shelte The	ENE		
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS							
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLA	.ss .	SUBCLASS	FILING DA			
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	<u> </u>	·					
		DOCUMENT	DATE	COUNTRY	CLA	cc	SUBCLASS	TRANSI			
		NUMBER			1		30802433	TRANSLA YES	NO NO		
(OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	inent Pages,	Etc.)					
000	120	Oxford Gene Techni	ology (OG I) v.	Mergen's Motion for Reco Mergen Ltd et al., U.S. Di ilmington, Delaware.	nsiderationstrict Cou	n, in the	e United State e District of Do	es litigation be elaware, CA N	tween No.		
HS.	121	Khrapko, K. et al., "/ pp. 118-122, Octobe	hrapko, K. et al., "An oligonucleotide hybridization approach to DNA sequencing", FEBS, Vol. 256, Nos. 1-2, p. 118-122, October 1989.								
20 20 15 Ke	122	I Luscom or unerroga	itories, in the U J.S. District Coi	elechem International, Inc nited States litigation beto urt for the District of Delav	veen Oxfo	rd Gen	e Technology	MCD v Tak	ohom		
Jeo	123	Polsky-Cynkin, R. et Hybridization", Clinic	al., "Use of DN al Chemistry, \	IA Immobilized on Plastic /ol. 31, No. 9, pp. 1438-14	and Agard 143, 1985.	ose Sur	oports to Dete	ct DNA by Sa	ndwich		
	124	I magnoti netweell OX	iora Gene Teci	rd Gene Technology Limit hnology (OGT) v. Motorolo pp. 1-81, December 2003,	a Inc IIS	S Dietri	ct Court for th	n the United S le Northeaste	States		
40006/15/4	125	Brinks Hofer Gilson 8 Gene Technology (O 02-9344, pp. 1-39, Va	GIJV. MOLOTOK	la's Response Markman I a, Inc., U.S. District Court hicago, Illinois.	Brief, in the for the No	e Unite	d States litigatern District of	tion between	Oxford 0.		
no on	126	Detirecti Oxiola Gelle	e recomblogy (r	la's Response Markman E OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U. January 2004, Chicago, II	S District	bits A-Z Court f	the United Sor the Northea	States litigation astern District	n of		
	127	Triniban Oxiona Ochic	· · COIIIIOIOUY (la's Response Markman E DGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U. anuary 2004, Chicago, Illir		oits A(1 Court fo)-G(1), the Un or the Northea	ited States lit estern District	igation of		
	128	nemeen oxidia Gelle	i echinology (C	a's Response Markman B DGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S Inuary 2004, Chicago, Illir	S Dietrict	oits 1-3, Court fo	the United St or the Northea	ates litigation estern District	of		
XAMINER	al	5. Bruns	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DATE CONSIDERE	0 56	· la	reser 200 F	<u> </u>			

Sheet 17 of 17			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	T		PE WO			
FORM PTO 1449 (_	RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL I 09/422	NO. 804	DEC SO JORY	के अ		
PA	TENT AN	ID TRADEMARK OFFICE INCES CITED BY APPLICAT	E	APPLICANT Edwin Southern		13	OFC - OFM	*		
Date S		eral sheets if necessary) to PTO: December 20, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	TO THOUSE			
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPI			
								•		
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	ATION NO		
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)					
	129	Michael Best & Fried Gene Technology (C 02-93 4, pp. 1-21, M	DGT) v. Motoro	rs Reply to Markman Brief, la, Inc., U.S. District Court nicago, Illinois.	, in the United Si for the Northeas	tates litigation tern District o	between Oxf f Illinois, CA N	ord Vo.		
	130	Technology (OGT) v	Michael Best & Friedrich LLP, OGT's Exhibit A Claim Chart, in the United States litigation between Oxford Gene Technology (OGT) v. Motorola, Inc., U.S. District Court for the Northeastern District of Illinois, CA No. 02-9344, op. 1-10, March 2004, Chicago, Illinois.							
	131	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v pp. 1-139, March 20	. Motorola, Inc.	's Exhibit 1-9, in the United ., U.S. District Court for the linois.	d States litigation Northeastern D	n between Oxf istrict of Illinoi	ord Gene s, CA No. 02-	9344,		
3 / E/	132	Michael Best & Fried Technology (OGT) v pp. 1-222, March 200	. Motorola, Inc.	's Exhibit H-R, in the Unite ., U.S. District Court for the inois.	d States litigation Northeastern D	n between Ox istrict of Illinoi	ford Gene s, CA No. 02-	9344,		
726/136	133	Civil Docket for CA N Delaware, pp. 1-36,	lo. 99-0348, O April 2005, Wil	xford Gene Technology (O mington, Delaware.	GT) v. Affymetrix	c, Inc., U.S. Di	strict Court fo)r		
011	134	Civil Docket for CA N Delaware, pp. 1-31, /	lo. 02-1695, O: April 2005, Wili	xford Gene Technology (Omington, Delaware.	GT) v. Mergen, l	td., U.S. Disti	rict Court for			
	135	Civil Docket for CA N Court for Delaware, p	lo. 04-0013, O pp. 1-7, April 20	Gord Gene Technology (Od 005, Wilmington, Delaware	GT) v. Telechem	International	Inc., U.S. Dis	strict		
	136	Civil Docket for CA N Delaware, pp. 1-5, Ap	o. 02-1687, Ox oril 2005, Wilm	oford Gene Technology (Odington, Delaware.	GT) v. Nanogen,	Inc., U.S. Dis	trict Court for			
	137	Civil Docket for CA N Northeastern District	o. 02-9344, Ox of Illinois, pp. 1	ford Gene Technology (OCI-4, April 2005, Chicago, III	GT) v. Motorola, inois.	Inc., U.S. Dist	rict Court for	the		
EXAMINER	WK	· Bruser		DATE CONSIDERE	o 5 Folia	uses 200	6			

Sheet 1 of 13			INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	IT		·		
FPREPTO 1449	S. DEPAR	RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422			
2 2005	REFERE	ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	_	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
FRADENINGATE		eral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631		
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	С	LASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D	
JK)	AA	4,216,245	8/1980	Johnson		427	2		
NA	АВ	4,395,486	7/1983	Wilson et al.		435	6	·	
Jes S	AC	4,563,419	1/1986	Ranki et al.		435	6		
			FORE	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	С	LASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
18/5	AD	0 235 726	9/1987	EP					
#5	AE	0 171 150	2/1986	EP					
183	AF	85/01051	3/1985	wo					
J83	AG	0 268 237	5/1988	EP		·			
	AH								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Page	s, Etc.)		·	
	AI	Declaration from Ra	domir Crkvenja	akov (with four exhibits), Se	eptembe	er 1996.			
	AJ	Declaration from Iva	n Labat , Septe	ember 1996.					
· s	AK	Statement from the 1996.	nstitute of Mole	ecular Genetics and Genet	tic Engir	neering (IMGGE) in Bel	grade, Septe	mber
nek	AL	Statement by Profes symposium, and a po	sor Roger Ekin ost-published p	s (with an abstract of a lec paper corresponding to said	cture giv d lectur	en by hir e), Decer	m on 4/11/88 a mber 1996.	ta	
01	АМ	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. Nichlole	as Vaughan Ashely (with E	xhibit N	VA1), Ma	эу 1995.		
ı	АИ	Statutory Declaration	of Dr. William	Bains (with Exhibits WB1,	WB2 a	nd WB3)	, May 1995.		
EXAMINER	To de	Busa	-	DATE CONSIDER	ED (Felm	au 200/		

Sheet 2 of 13	4		INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	IT		
FORM PTO 1449 U.		RTMENT OF COMMER	CE	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		al no. 22,804	
PA	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFI ENCES CITED BY APPLIC	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN			
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631	
				S. PATENT DOCUMENTS			
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
18/2	ВА	4,704,353	11/1987	Humphries et al.	435	4	
165	ВВ	4,327,073	4/1982	Huang	424	1	
My.	ВС	4,728,502	3/1988	Hamill	422	116	
Jes	BD	5,002,867	3/1991	Macevicz	435	6	
<u>V</u>		y	FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO
1865	BE	88/01302	2/1988	wo			
Jes	BF	86/03782	7/1986	wo			
RB	BG	0 238 332	9/1987	EP			
PB	ВН	2 156 074	10/1985	GB			
100	BI '	0 237 362	9/1987	EP			
<u> </u>		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S)	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)		
	BJ	Declaration of Profe	essor Lubert Str	ryer, January 1997.			
	вк	Statutory Declaration	n of Dr. William	n Bains, January 1997.			
leshe	BL	Statutory Declaration	n of Dr. Nichola	as Vaughan Ashley, Januar	y 1997.		
pul	BM,	Declaration of Edwin	n Mellor Southe	rm (with Exhibits EMS1 and	I EMS2), Janu	ary 1998.	
11.	BN	Declaration of Dr. Th	nomas Gingera	s, January 1999.			
	во	Declaration of Profes	ssor Calvin Qua	ate, January 1999.			
XAMINER	13	Burs		DATE CONSIDERE	D 5 F.J.	maly 200	6

							· —			
Sheet 3 of 13	,		INFORMA	TION DISC	LOSURE STATEMEN	T				
FORM PTO 1449 U.S	S. DEPA	RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DO	OCKET NO. 174		SERIAL 09/422			
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Έ	APPLICA Edwin	ANT SOUTHERN	_				
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	2005		FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631					
			U.	S. PATENT	DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	C	LASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D	
RB.	· CA	5,202,231	4/1993	Dr	manac et al.	4	135	6		
KG	СВ	5,474,796	12/1995		Brennan	4	127	2.13		
163	СС	5,429,807	7/1995	М	atson et al.	4	22	131		
7		1	FORE	EIGN PATEI	NT DOCUMENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	Cı	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
12/3	CD	89/11548	11/1989		WO					
193	CE	93/22480	11/1993		wo _.		····			·
Jest .	CF	0 386 229	9/1990		EP					
186	CG	0 281 927	9/1988		EP					
J83_	СН	0 130 739	1/1985		EP					
	,	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	ncluding Aut	hor, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages	, Etc.)			
٠ _ر	CI	Declaration of Dr. Gl	enn Mc Gall, J	anuary 19	999.					_
. \$	CJ	Declaration of Edwin	Mellor Southo	en luke 2	001					
ala		230.01.01.23	menor southe	in, July 2	001.					
32	СК	Bird & Bird, "Claiman Technology (OGT) v.	it's Notice of Ex Affymetrix, ca	xperiment se no. HC	ts", In the United I 1999 02517, pp	Kingdon 5. 1-12,	n Litigati July 31,	ion between Ox 2000, London,	ford Gene United King	dom.
	CL	Declaration of Marvin	Stodolsky, Oc	dober 199	96.			- 1, <u>-</u>		
869	СМ	M. S. Urdea et al., "A biological samples wi human serum", Gene	thout blotting c	or radioac	tivity: application	pecific r to the a	nucleotic nalysis o	de sequences in of hepatitis B vir	rude rus in	
Jess	CN C. G. Miyada et al., "Oligonucleotide Hybridization Techniques", Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 154, No. 6, 1987, pp. 94-107.									
EXAMINER	Jo	L. Burs			DATE CONSIDERE	D 5	Feli	man 200t	8	

^{*}EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy this form with next communication to applicant.

Sheel 4 of 13 .	,		INFORMA	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	ıτ					
FORM PTO 1449 U.) RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422			_	
_	F REFER	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	-	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631						
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING I APPROI		
18/5	DA	4,591,570	5/1986	Chang	4	36	518			
V	DB								<u> </u>	
	DC									
	T	7	FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	,					
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO	
JEAS .	DD	0 228 075	7/1987	EΡ						
215	DE	84/03151	8/1984	wo						
jeß	DF	0 194 132	9/1986	EP						
13	DG	0 063 810	11/1982	EP						
JEB	DH	0 130 523	1/1985	EP						
<u> </u>	·····	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages	Etc.)				
SPO	DI	E. Calva et al., "Anal Gel Electrophoresis, Chemistry, Vol. 255,	RNA-DNA Hyb	itro Synthesis of 5'-γ- ³² P-la pridization, and RNase T1 I pp. 11011-11016.	abeled T Digestio	ranscrip n", The .	ts from Coliph: lournal of Biok	age λ by ogical		
SP	DJ	A. R. Dunn et al., "A mRNA and Discrete	Novel Method Multiple Region	to Map Transcripts: Eviden ns of the Viral Genome", Co	ice for H ell, Vol.	lomology 12, Sept	between an A ember 1977, p	\denovirus pp. 23-36.		
86	DK	G. Wengler et al.,"A Alphaviruses", Virolo	Study of Nucleo	otide Sequence Homology . 1, 1977, pp. 124-134.	Betwee	n the Nu	cleic Acids of	Different		
Je C	DL	J. M. Coffin et al., "St Sequence" Cell, Vol.	ructure of the 0 13, No. 4, April	Genome of Moloney Murine 1978, pp. 761-773.	e Leukei	nia Virus	s: A Terminally	Redundant		
JB	DM	A. Palva et al., "Labor Acid Sandwich with H	ratory Methods lybridization", D	, Quantification of α-Amyla NA, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1988, p	se mRN p. 135-1	IA in <i>Bac</i> 42.	cillus subtilis b	y Nucleic		
JES	DN	R. Drmanac et al., "Sequencing of Megabase Plus DNA by Hybridization: Theory of the Method", abstract presented at Cold Spring Harbor Symposium on Gene Mapping and Sequencing, April 27-May 1, 1988, Cold Spring Harbor, NY.								
XAMINER	111	Buck	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DATE CONSIDERE	ر سو	C 0 .	7/10	7		

						·			
Sheet 5 of 13	,		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEME	NT				
FORM PTO 1449	•) RTMENT OF COMMERC	~E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174		SERIAL 09/422			
PA	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					-
	(Use se	veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8,		FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631		
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER . INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING D APPROP	
-	EA								
	EB			ļ					
			FORI	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	<u> I </u>		<u></u>		
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBÇLASS	TRANSL/ YES	ATION NO
1203	EC	0 142 299	5/1985	EP					
Jes .	ED	86/06487	11/1986	wo					
Jeb	EE	84/03564	9/1984	wo					
Jes	EF	86/00991	2/1986	wo					
Jes	EG	92/10092	6/1992	wo					
	- _I	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages	Etc.)			
X6	ЕН	R. Drmanac et al., " Harbor Symposium	Sequencing by on Gene Mapp	Hybridization , Theory of ting and Sequencing, April	he Metho 27-May	od", pos 1, 1988	iter presented a , Cold Spring H	t Cold Spring arbor, NY.	g
25,180	ΕI	I. Labat "Subfragme Report, Labat Thesi	ents as an infor s, (and English	mative characteristic of the translation), 1988.	e DNA m	olecule	- computer sim	ulation", Sea	arch
SB	ΕJ	R. Frank et al., "Sim Complete Methodolo	ultaneous Synt ogy", Methods i	hesis and Biological Appli n Enzymology, Vol. 154, N	cations o	f DNA F 987, pp.	ragments: An I 221-251.	Efficient and	
Ag.	EK	R. Frank et al., "A ne oligonucleotides: seç	ew general appi gmental solid si	roach for the simultaneous upports", Nucleic Acids Re	s chemic esearch,	al synth Vol. 11,	esis of large nu No. 13, 1983, _l	mber of op. 4365-437	77.
yes	EL	A. R. Brautigam et al Deoxyribonucleic Ac pp. 226-234.	I., "Rapid Typin id Hybridization	g of Herpes Simplex Virus ", Journal of Clinical Micro	Isolates	by Deo Vol. 12,	xyribonucleic A , No. 2, August	cid: 1980,	
JB	EM	R. K. Saiki et al., "An Oligonucleotide Prob	alysis of Enzymes", Nature, Vo	natically Amplified β-globir II. 324, November 1986, p	and HL p. 163-16	A-DQa (DNA with Allele	-Specific	
XAMINER	lo C	S. Dunca		DATE CONSIDER	ED 2	Colu	usu 200	7	

Sheet 6 of 13	•		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	7					
	FORM PTO 1449 (modified) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 09/422,804					
P	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	Ē.	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
Date		veral sheets if necessary) od to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999			GROUP 1631			
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL			DATE	NAME CLASS			SUBCLASS FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE			
.	FA									
	FB							·		
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
- 1.1		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSI YES		
	FC	0 305 929	3/1989	EP				···		
163	FD	0 304 202	2/1989	EP						
	FE									
	FF							·		
	FG									
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Author, Title, Date, Pertine	ent Pages	, Etc.)	I	···	<u> </u>	
JB VM	FH	A. Rosenthal et al., " different eligodeoxyr	Solid-phase mi	ethods for sequencing of n using a new, mechanically or 4,1985, pp. 1173-1184.	ucleic a	cids I. S	Simultaneous so exchange paper	equencing o	of cid	
Sos	FI	B. Lewin, Ed., "Gend	es", Third Edition	on, 1987, pp. 360-362, Joh	n Wiley	& Sons	, NY, NY.			
John	FJ	R. B. Wallace et al., Base Pair Mismatch	"Hybridization of Nucleic Acids	of Synthetic Oligodeoxyribo Research, Vol. 6, No. 11,	nucleo 1979, p	tides to p. 3543	O _x 174 DNA: Th -3557.	ne Effect of	Single	
J83 J83	FK	G. Beltz et al., "Isolat Methods", Methods in	ion of Multigen n Enzymology,	e Families and Determinati Vol. 100, No. 19, 1983, pp.	ion of H . 266-28	omologi 35.	ies by Filter Hy	bridization		
John John John John John John John John	FL	Russian Original, Vol	. 303, No. 1-6,	of the Academy of Science November-December 1988 num Publishing Corporation	3, pp. 3	55-452 a	and Translation	Section, from Russi	an,	
J83	FM	F. C. Kafatos et al., "[a dot Hybridization Pr	Determination of ocedure", Nucl	of Nucleic Acid Sequence Feic Acids Research, Vol. 7	iomolog No. 6,	gies and 1979, p	Relative Conc p. 1541-1552.	entrations b	у	
XAMINER	1	6. Bruses		DATE CONSIDEREI	, T	6.1.	1,100 24	26		

										
Sheet 7 of 13 ·			INFORMA	ATION DISC	LOSURE STATEMEN	ıT T				
U.S	FORM PTO 1449 (modified) U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE LIST OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT(S)				ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 99_1174 09/422,804					·
PA					APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date :		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING D	OATE er 22, 1999	-		GROUP 1631		
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS										
*EXAMINER INITIAL							FILING D APPROP			
	GA									
	GB									_ :
	GC				· ·				· .	
	T		FORE	EIGN PATEN	NT DOCUMENTS	1		 		
	ļ	DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		COUNTRY	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSL YES	ATION NO
	GD	,								
·	GE.									
	GF									
	GG									
	GH	-				l.				
	,	OTHER I	DOCUMENT(S) (ir	ncluding Aut	hor, Title, Date, Pertir	ent Page:	s, Etc.)			
AG	GI	R. J. Lipshutz et al., Vol. 19, No. 3, 1995,	"Using Oligonu , pp. 442-447.	ucleotide l	Probe Arrays to A	Access (Genetic C	Diversity", BioT	echniques,	
JED	GJ	T. R. Gingeras et al., 15, No. 13, 1987, pp.	, "Hybridization . 5373-5390.	Propertie	es of Immobilized	l Nucleid	Acid", N	lucleic Acids R	lesearch, Vo	ol.
J65.	GK	P.T. Gilham, "The Sy Polynucleotides", J. A	inthesis of Poly Am. Chem. Soi	ynucleotid c., Vol. 86	le-Celluloses and 6, November 20,	1 Their u 1964, p	se in the b. 4982-4	Fractionation 985.	of	
JB	GL	H. M. Geysen et al., " Methods, Vol. 102, 19	'Strategies for 987, pp. 259-2	Epitope A	Analysis using Pe	ptide Sy	nthesis",	, Journal of Im	munological	
SED	GM	G. M. Church et al., "	Genomic Sequ	iencing",	Proc. Natl. Acad.	Sci., Vo	ol. 81(7),	April 1984, pp	. 1991-1995.	
JG.	GN	V. J. Kidd et al., "α ₁ -A Nature, Vol. 304, July	ntitrypsin Defic 1983, pp. 230	ciency De 3-234.	tection by Direct	Analysi	s of the N	futation in the	Gene",	
XAMINER	Joe	Bruses			DATE CONSIDER	ED 5	Fale	may 201	16	

Sheet 8 of 13 ·	•		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	T				
FORM PTO 1449 U.	S. DEPA	RTMENT OF COMMERC	E	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174 SERIAL NO. 09/422,804					
PA	ATENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICAL	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date		veral sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631			
		·	U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	NAME CLASS SUBCLASS FILING DA APPROPR				
	НА								
•	НВ								
··	нс			· ·					
	HD								
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLAS	S SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	ATION NO	
•	HE								
	HF								
	-	OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, E	tc.)			
183	HG	P. Masinkowski et al Breast Cancer Cell L	P. Masinkowski et al., "Cloning f cDNA Sequences of Hormone-regulated Gene from the MCF-7 Human Breast Cancer Cell Line", Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 10, No. 24, 1982, pp. 7895-7903.						
SKS	НН	G. K. Sim et al., "Use Multigene Families",	e of a cDNA Lil Cell, Vol. 18, I	brary for Studies on Evolut No. 4, December 1979, pp.	ion and De 1303-131	evelopment Expressi 6.	on of the Cho	orion	
M/S	н	Margaret L. M. Ande Approach, 1985, pp.	rson et al., "Qu . 73-111, IRL F	rantitative Filter Hybridisati Press, Washington, D.C.	on", Nucle	ic Action Hybridisation	on, A Practica	al	
Jes Jes	HJ .	W. Bains et al., "A No pp. 303-307.	ovel Method fo	r Nucleic Acid Sequence D	Determinat	ion", J. Theor. Biol.,	Vol. 135, 198	38,	
M	нк	U. B. Voss et al., "The Society Transactions	e Immobilizatio , Vol. 16, 1988	on of Oligonucleotides and , pp. 216-217.	Their Hyb	ridization Properties	", Biochemica	al	
X	HL	13, 1987, pp. 5353-5	372.	of oligonucleotides to Solid	d Supports	s", Nucleic Acids Res	search, Vol. 1	5, No.	
DEA.	НМ	Λ	igs, Vol. 43, No	o. 7, May 4, 1984, Abstract		'A novel univ	versal		
10/5	ни			g", A Laboratory Manual, C		Harbor Laboratory,	1982, p. 282	, Cold	
AMINER		10.				linean 200			

Sheet 9 of 13 •	•		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	TV					
FORM PTO 1441	,	artment of commerc) F	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAI 09/42					
P.	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
Date	-	everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	2005	FILING DATE GROUP October 22, 1999 1631						
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS		 _				
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT DATE NAME CLASS SUBC				SUBCLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE			
	IA									
	···		FORI	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS			,			
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO			
	IB									
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, Etc.)					
jes	IC	C. R. Cantor et al., " pp. 1378-1383.	Report on the	Sequencing by Hybridizati	on Workshop",	Genomics, Vol.	13, 1992,			
JB	ID	T. L. Bugawan et al. Sequencing-Specific	T. L. Bugawan et al., "Rapid HLA-DLB Typing Using Enzymatically Amplified DNA and Nonradioactive Sequencing-Specific Oligonucleotide Probes", Immunogenetics, Vol. 32, 1990, pp. 231-241.							
Us Granger	ΙE	Global Technology C	Global Technology Group, Flier for PA Consulting Group, 1988.							
JC	IF	Stephen P. A. Fodor Vol. 251, February 1	et al., "Light-D 5, 1991, pp. 76	irected, Spatially Address: 57-773.	able Parallel Ch	emical Synthesi	s", Science,			
SED	IG	U. Maskos et al., "A S Synthesised on a Gla	Study of Oligor ass Support", N	nucleotide Reassociation u Nucleic Acids Research, Vo	ising Large Arra ol. 21, No. 20, 1	ys of Oligonucle 992, pp. 4663-4	otides 669.			
yo	ΙΗ	U. Maskos et al., "Pa Factors Influencing O pp. 1675-1678.	rallel Analysis Iligonucleotide	of Oligodeoxyribonucleotic Duplex Formation", Nucle	de (Oligonucleot ic Acids Resear	ide) Interactions ch, Vol. 20, No.	i. I. Analysis of 7, 1992,			
JS	11	J. C. Williams et al., " Dangling Ends on Du	Studies of Olig uplex Yield", No	onucleotide Interactions bucleic Acids Research, Vo	y Hybridisation I. 22, No. 8, 199	to Arrays: The Ir 4, pp. 1365-136	offluence of			
XC	IJ	E. M. Southern et al., of Nucleic Acids, Nucl	"Arrays of Cor leic Acids Res	nplementary Oligonucleoti earch, Vol. 22, No. 8, 1994	des for Analysin 1, pp.1368-1373	ig the Hybridisat	ion Behaviour			
86	ΙΚ	M. S. Shchepinov et a Nucleic Acids Researd	il.,"Steric Facto ch, Vol. 25, No	ors Influencing Hybridisation. 6, 1997, pp. 1155-1161.	on of Nucleic Ac	ids to Oligonucle	eotide Arrays",			
Jeo.	IL	S. C Case-Green et al to Oligonucleotides", N	l.,"Studies on t Nucleic Acids F	he Base Pairing Properties Research, Vol. 22, No. 2, 1	s of Deoxyinosin 994, pp. 131-13	ne by Solid Phas 16.	e Hybridisation			
XAMINER		1. Brusis		DATE CONSIDERE	o seel	man 2	20/			

Sheet 10 of 13	•		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE STATEMEN	Ţ						
FORM PTO 1449	•	and the comment of comments of comments of comments of comments of comments of the comments of	Æ	ATTY DOCKET NO. 99_1174	SERIAL 09/42						
P.	ATENT A	AND TRADEMARK OFFIC RENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN							
Date	•	everal sheets if necessary) ed to PTO: December 8, 2	005	FILING DATE October 22, 1999		GROUP 1631					
			U.	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS	S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME CLASS SUBCLASS FILING DA APPROPRI							
	JA										
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCUMENTS	·						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NO NO			
	JB		_								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Pertin	ent Pages, Etc.)			~			
. Ho	JC	U. Maskos et al., "A Acids Research, Vo	Novel Method ol. 21, No. 9, 19	for the Parallel Analysis of 93, 2269-2270.	Multiple Mutati	ons in Multiple (Samples", Nu	ıcleic			
Jes -	JD	M. J. Kozal et al., "Extensive Polymorphisms Observed in HIV-1 Clade B Protease Gene Using High-Density Oligonucleotide Arrays", Nature Medicine, Vol. 2, No. 7, July 1996, pp. 753-759.									
JBS	JE	M. Chee et al., "Accessing Genetic Information with High-Density DNA Arrays", Science, Vol. 274, October 1996, pp. 610-614.									
Solo	JF	Kirk -Othmer, Encycl	Kirk -Othmer, Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, Third Edition, Vol. 3, pp. 487-491, 1978.								
H)	JG	Kirk-Othmer, Encyclo	ppedia of Chem	nical Technology, Third Edi	tion, Vol. 15, p.	224, 1981.					
JB.	JH	R. Polsky-Cynkin et a Sandwich Hybridizati	al.,"Use of DNA on, Clinical Ch	a Immobilized on Plastic an nemistry, Vol. 31, No. 9, 19	d Agarose Sup 85, pp. 1438-14	ports to Detect 143.	DNA by				
HB	JI	J. Welsh et al.,"Prote	in-DNA Cross-	Linking" TIBS, Vol. 9, Dece	ember 1984, pp	. 505-508.					
80	IJ	G. H. Parsons, Jr., "A pp. 224-238.	ntibody-Coated	d Plastic Tubes in Radioim	munoassay", M	leth., Enzymol.,	Vol. 73, 197	3,			
Jeb 1	JK	Southern et al., Genor Oligonucleotides", Vol	mics, "Analyzin I.13, 1992, pp.	ng and Comprising Nucleic 1008-1017.	Acid Sequence	es by Hybridizat	ion to Arrays	of			
	JL										
XAMINER		W B.		DATE CONCIDENCE			/				

Sheet 11 of 13	۵		INFORMA	TION DISCLO	SURE STATEMENT					
FORM PTO 1449 U.S		RTMENT OF COMMERC	E		ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 09/422,804					
PA	TENT A	ND TRADEMARK OFFIC ENCES CITED BY APPLICA	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
Date		veral sheets if necessary) d to PTO: December 8, 2	005	FILING DA October				GROUP 1631		
	· · · · · ·		U.	S. PATENT D	PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE		NAME	CI	ASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA APPROPR	
183	КА	5,486,452	1/1996	Gor	don et al.	4	35	5		
1865	КВ	4,994,373	2/1991	Stavrian	opoulos et al.	4	35	6	·	
185	кс	4,968,602	11/1990	Da	ittagupta	4	35	6		
183	KD	4,961,915	10/1990	٨	Martin	4	22	116		
150	KE	4,849,330	7/1989	Hump	hries et al.	4	35	4		
. JeD	KF	4,451,433	5/1984	Yama	shita et al.	4	22	63		
BB	KG	5,202,231	4/1993	Dr	rmanac	4	35	6		
180	кн	4,299,916	11/1981	Litm	nan et al.	4	35	6		
$\overline{}$			FORE	IGN PATENT	DOCUMENTS					7 9
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	cc	DUNTRY	CL	ASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	ION NO
JEB .	КІ	84/01031	3/1984		wo					
	·	OTHER I	DOCUMENT(S) (In	cluding Autho	or, Title, Date, Pertiner	nt Pages	Etc.)			
·JB	KJ	Webster's Third New USA, 1966, pages w	International Lith the definition	Dictionary, ons of the te	G & C Merriam C erms "solid" and "	compai 'sheet"	ny, Publ	ishers, Springf	ield, Massachi	usetts,
JC.	KK	The American Herita 1991, page with the o	ge Dictionary, definition of the	Second Co e term "smo	illege Edition, Ho poth".	ughtor	Mifflin (Company, Bos	ton, Massachu	usetts,
SHI	KL	The Dictionary of Cenglass".	ramic Science	and Engine	eering, Plenum P	ress, N	lew Yorl	k, NY, 1984 - d	efinition of "sn	nooth
Jeo	KM	Academic Press Dicti	ionary of Scien	ice and Tec	chnology, San Die	ego, C	A , 1992	! - definition of	"smooth".	
J6	KN	S. F. Wolf et al., "Rap Acids Research, Vol.	oid Hybridizatio 15, No. 7, 198	n Kinetics o 7, pp. 2911	of DNA Attached -2926.	to Sut	micron	Latex Particles	", Nucleic	
J63	ко	J. N. Kremsky et al., " Group at the 5' Termin	Immobilization nus", Nucleic A	of DNA via	o Oligonucleotide arch, Vol. 15, No.	s Cont 7, 198	aining a	n Aldehyde or 891-2909	Carboxylic Ac	id
EXAMINER	4	M. Brunca			DATE CONSIDERED	*	Colin	10.10	6	

Sheet 12 of 13			INFORM	ATION DISCLOSURE STATEME					
FORM PTO 1449	•	MENT OF COMMERC	0.5	ATTY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NO. 09/422,804					
PA	ATENT AND	TRADEMARK OFFICE	CE	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN					
Date	(Use several sheets if necessary) Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005		FILING DATE October 22, 1999						
	<u> </u>			J.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS					
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUBCLASS	FILING DA		
	LA								
	LB								
	LC							-	
_			FOR	EIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS					
•		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLAT YES	ION	
······································	LD								
	LE								
	LF								
	LG		-						
	LH								
		OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (I	ncluding Author, Title, Date, Perti	nent Pages, Etc.)		<u></u>		
	LI L	etter to Simon Kidd	lle from Dr. Re	nzo Malvano, November 2	2002.				
<u> </u>	LJ L	etter to Simon Kidd	le from Dr. Gia	an Carlo Zucchelli, Noveml	ber 2002.				
100115K	LK D	eclaration of Profes	ssor Alberto Al	bertini, November 2002.					
	LL D	eclaration of Dr. Gi	anni Messeni	November 2002.					
	LM Se	econd Statement of	Professor Ro	ger Ekins, January 2003.				V	
	عاميا								
IINER	18-L	Fresch		DATE CONSIDER	ED TE.	warn 200	7		

			<u> </u>			_				
Sheet 13 of 13	<u>, </u>		INFORMA	TION DISCLOSURE	TATEMENT	,				
FORM PTO 1449		STREET OF CORRECTO	r	ATTY DOCKET NO 99_1174).	SERIAL NO. 09/422,804				
PA	TENT A	RTMENT OF COMMERC ND TRADEMARK OFFIC INCES CITED BY APPLICAL	E	APPLICANT Edwin SOUTHERN						
	(Use several sheets if necessary) Date Submitted to PTO: December 8, 2005			FILING DATE October 22, 19	99		GROUP 1631			
			11:	S. PATENT DOCUME						
*EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DOCUMENT DATE NAME CLASS SUBCLASS					FILING DA		
	МА									
	МВ									
			FORE	IGN PATENT DOCU	MENTS					
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTR	, c	LASS	SUBCLASS	TRANSLA YES	NO NO	
	MC									
	MD									
. (OTHER	DOCUMENT(S) (II	ncluding Author, Title,	Date, Pertinent Page	s, Etc.)	· 		· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
040	ME	Slides used in Profe April 1988.	OTHER DOCUMENT(S) (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.) Slides used in Professor Ekins' lecture at the International Biotech RIA '88 Conférence in Florence on 11 th April 1988.							
AC	MF		Lev. D. Gelb and K.E. Gubbins, "Characterization of Porous Glasses by Adsorption: Models, Simulations and Data Inversion", Fundamentals of Adsorption, Vol. 6, 1999, pp. 551-556.							
. J&3	MG	Pharmacia Catalogu	ie 1998, page o	describing Hybon	d-NX.					
Capisal	мн	Translation of EP A	0197266 filed f	or UK national va	lidation, 1991.					
200 / 200 /	МІ	E. M. Southern, Awa	rd Molecular B	ioanalytics 2004,	Biography.					
1900	MJ	Award Molecular Bio	analytics 2004.							
Jes	MK	Bio Array News, Vol.	1, No. 1, June	1, 2001, pp. 1-10).					
Jes	ML	News Events, Journa	I of Biomolecu	lar Techniques, V	ol. 15, 2004, pp	o. 152-15	53.			
EXAMINER	Jul	Jel. Bruset DATE CONSIDERED 5 February 2006								

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

BLACK BORDERS

IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES

FADED TEXT OR DRAWING

BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING

SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES

COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS

GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

☐ OTHER:

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.